

DD/S&T# 2214/74

3 JUN 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DCI

SUBJECT: Revamping the KIQ Evaluation Process

Recently you have been hearing a lot of complaints about the KIQ's and the KIQ evaluation process, and I would guess that it is sometimes difficult for you to distinguish whether the criticisms go to the KIQ concept itself or only to the paper work that has grown up around the KIQ Evaluation Process. I personally consider the KIQ's to be a very useful and important innovation and I think you should feel comfortable that most people recognize the importance of having for the first time a list of the questions which the DCI considers to be of highest priority. Likewise, I think you should feel content that many benefits can accrue from some kind of a procedure which would use the KIQ's as a focus for periodic review of collection system performance. I therefore encourage you to concern yourself only with revising the procedures which have been established to perform the KIQ evaluations; these have, I believe, been formalized to the point where they endanger the true value of the evaluations.

It seems to me that the great benefit that can result from the KIQ evaluation process is a discipline which will force the production office managers and their next level supervisors to periodically ask themselves how well the collectors are doing against Key Intelligence Questions and to report their impressions about this to you. If these individuals personally review this question, say, every six months, that action in itself would stimulate analysts all down the line to take on as part of their daily activities the function of evaluating their sources of information as they receive the data. This would provide you with a constant base of information and a source of critique from which your NIO's can draw whenever a specific value judgment must be made; and it will inevitably promote a continuing dialogue between users and collectors about the utility of the collector's product. This is a very practical, worthwhile and, I believe, sufficient benefit that you can hope to get from a properly constructed KIQ evaluation process.

The question is then, how to arrange that process in a way which will force the personal attention of the production office managers and their next level supervisors on the issues. I do not think you can

attain this result from the kind of formalized procedures that have so far been attempted. Indeed, I think these will only bring the process to the level of other routine reporting and will cause the very people whom you want to be involved to give only lip service to the process.

I propose instead the following. In the past I have heard you speak of your hope that KIQ evaluations could be made on one or two pages. I suggest that you insist on that, and rather than ask your IC Staff to administer the process, you go directly to the managers of the production offices around the community and require that each office manager and each of their next level supervisors prepare a one or two page evaluation for each KIQ, that they write it out in their personal hand, and that they compose it only after a face-to-face review with their next level subordinates on each Key Intelligence Question. I suggest that you require all of these individuals to have such a hand written evaluation in your office on the first of January and the first of July of each year. If possible, it would be useful for you to follow the receipt of these evaluations with a series of meetings at which these managers would personally summarize their evaluations for you.

It may seem peculiar to you that I specify that the evaluations be submitted in the hand of the submitting officer, but I believe that this is the only way that you can prevent the procedure from devolving into an evaluation written primarily by staff people and typed out for the boss to sign. As such it would probably be prepared without the full participation of the manager whose personal attention and experience you are trying to involve.

I would also prohibit anyone from trying to collate these opinions after they are submitted in an attempt to provide some comprehensive evaluation of the full array of collection resources. I think such a collation would not only be misleading (since the data base is too narrow, being derived from only the high priority KIQ's) but would inevitably put pressure on those submitting the reports for adherence to a more and more structured and formalized evaluation (with no doubt an end objective of getting results into a computer). Your purposes will be well served if you will insist on a process that has the single objective of forcing the attention of your intelligence production managers on the question of collection system performance against the Key Intelligence Questions. The specific answers that come out of such a review are much less important, I believe, than the fact that the review is regularly taking place.

25X1

STAT

Donald H. Steininger /

cc: Mr. Duckett
Dr. Proctor
Mr. Nelson
Mr. Carver
Gen. Graham

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

DATE: 5 June 1974

TO: All NIOs
FROM: GACarver, Jr.
SUBJECT: More on the KIQs

REMARKS:

Don Steininger, as you probably know, will soon be leaving the Agency to take a senior post with the Xerox Corporation. During his last few weeks, Don is firing shots in all directions, speaking his mind bluntly on various subjects in the belief that he is in a unique position to say things others might also be thinking but might consider it politic to keep to themselves. Attached is a note he has sent the DCI on "Revamping the KIQ Evaluation Process" which I think you will all find interesting and points to some of the questions bound to arise in our 6 June session with the DCI on this subject.

George A. Carver, Jr.

George A. Carver, Jr.
D/DCI/NIO

Attachment

C
U
R
R
E
N
T

I
N
F
O
R
M
A
T
I
O
N

KIQ file
D/NIO Chrono